REMARKS

Claims 1-43 were previously pending in this application. No claims have been amended, added or deleted. As a result claims 1-43 as previously presented are pending for examination with claims 1, 10, 13, 14, 15, 16 and 21 being independent claims. No new matter has been added.

SUMMARY OF TELEPHONE CONFERENCE

The Applicant would like to thank the Examiner for taking the time to discuss the Final Office Action and the merits of the claims of this application on August 19, 2005. During the telephone conversation the Applicant's Attorney discussed with the Examiner his response to Applicant's arguments in response to the first Office Action, namely paragraphs 3-5 of the Final Office Action. No agreement was reached, but the Applicant's representative agreed to resubmit its prior response to the pending rejections, which are the same in the Final Office Action as in the first Office Action, in light of this discussion. During this conversation, Applicant's representative also clarified terms of the claims and what Applicant's representative believes is the Examiner's misinterpretation of the Rozen et al. (6,073, 106) reference.

EXAMINER'S RESPONSE TO PRIOR ARGUMENTS

In the response to the first Office Action, Applicant argued that Rozen et al. does not teach an access mechanism which, for each access request to a database, includes at least one of a coded indication of the entity requesting the access and the status of such entity, and does not teach, in response to such access request, determining from at least one of provided coded indication of entity and coded indication of entity status whether the entity is entitled to access the requested data, as claimed in independent claims 1 and 16.

In the Final Office Action, the Examiner asserts that Rozen et al. teaches categorizing personal information into a first and second category, and associating a first pin (PIN-1) or a second pin (PIN 2) with the categorized personal information (see column 4, lines, 39-44), and as based on the status of the requestor, Emergency PIN (E-PIN) or Confidential PIN (C-PIN) access is provided to the requestor to access categorized information, where he/she present during a request to access participant's information (i.e., a coded indication of the entity status requesting

the access (see column 7, lines (column 4, lines 54-61 and column 7, lines 8-14)). The Examiner further asserts that Rozen et al. further teaches that the requester uses identifier and password to access participant's information (i.e., coded indication of entity (see column 4, lines 53-58)).

During the telephone conversation with the Examiner on August 19, Applicant's attorney pointed out that independent claims 1 and 16 recite an identifier of the requestor and coding of the identifier of the requestor, and that the E-PIN or the C-PIN that the Examiner refers to is not an identifier of the requestor, but in contrast is an identifier of the participant whose information is sought. In other words, the system and method of claims 1 and 16 require a mechanism which permits access to a database containing information of the participant, when such access request includes a coded indication of the party requesting the information or a coded indication of the status of the party. The Rozen et al. reference does not disclose or suggest coding the identify of the party requesting the information or the status of the party requesting the information, but instead merely discloses PINs associated with the confidential information of the participant (C-PIN) and with the emergency information of the participant (E-PIN) that is being requested. The Examiner agreed to review the Rozen et al. reference in view of this clarification.

In the response to the first Office Action, Applicant argued that Rozen et al. does not teach a database from which a provider of services can obtain a public code of an entity seeking such services (the participant), as claimed in independent claims 10 and 21.

In the Final Office Action, the Examiner pointed out that Rozen et al. teaches storing an identifier and password with personal information in a data file (see for example, column 4, lines 47-50) and associating the identifier and password with stored personal information for user access (column 7, lines 4-14).

In the telephone conference of August 19, 2005, the Applicant's representative pointed out that the independent claims 10 and 21 recite a database from which a provider of services can obtain a public code of an entity seeking services, which is directed to a database where a service provider can go to obtain the public code of the participant of the system and method of the invention. In particular, the system and method of Applicant's invention as claimed in independent claims 10 and 21 is directed to a database where a service provider can go to obtain a public code identifying the participant to who the services are to be provided, which public code can be used to map to data required by the service provider in order to provide the services to the participant. In contrast, although the Rozen et al. reference discloses that the participant

has an identifier, such as the participant's social security number, as well as PINs associated with the type of data such as confidential or emergency data, but Rozen et al. does not disclose or suggest that the service provider can go to a database to get the identifier of that participant to whom services are to be provided. In contrast, Rozen et al. discloses that the participant must provide the identifier and PIN to the service provider so that the service provider can get access to the database containing the information. The Examiner promised to review the Rozen et al. reference in view of these clarifying comments and consider the rejection again in view of Applicant's response.

In the response to the first Office Action, Applicant argued that Rozen et al. does not teach a mechanism by which an organization desiring access to data in the database of the secure registry system comprises a processor which generates data request, including a form in which such data is to be provided, and a response mechanism which, in response to such form, formats the collected data in that form and sends the formatted data in that form as claimed in independent claims 13 and 15. Applicant further argued that Rozen et al. does not teach a contact mechanism by which an entity making a query to the secure registry system can contact a matching individual only through the system, no contact information being provided to the entity, as is claimed in independent claim 14.

In the Final Office Action, the Examiner asserts that Rozen et al. teaches a mechanism by which an organization desiring access to data in said database may gain such access [column 7, lines 15-20], each said organization having a processor (i.e., requesters computer, see column 5, lines 32-41) which generates data requests, each such data request including a form in which such data is to be provided (i.e., a form in which data is provided includes screen viewing, email and fax) (column 7, lines 20-33, column 9, lines 47-64); and a response mechanism which collects data required by said form for a given request, formats the collected data in said form, and send the formatted data to the organization generating the request (column 7, lines 47-53 and column 9, lines 55-64). The Examiner further asserts that Rozen et al. further teaches a contact mechanism by which the entity making the query can contact a matching individual only through the system, no contact information being provided to the entity (i.e., the entity making the query gains access to biographical data of the entity, through the system) [column 7, lines 47-53, and column 7, lines 17-33].

In the telephone conference of August 19, 2005, the Applicant's attorney pointed out that independent claims 13 and 15 require a processor that generates data requests, including a form in which the data is to be provided, a response mechanism which, in response to receipt of the data request including the form, formats the collected data and puts the data into the form and sends the formatted data in the form to the requestor. In particular, Applicant's representative pointed out to the Examiner that the form of the data is, for example, a job application form, or another type of form and not a format, such as a fax format, as asserted by the Examiner. In addition, Applicant's attorney pointed out that the Applicant claims both the form to which the data is to be populated per independent claims 13 and 15, as well as the format in which the data is to be provided, in other dependent claims that depend from these independent claims, and that the Examiner cannot use the format of the data to reject both the form in which the data is to be populated, as well as the format of the data in which the data is provided. In addition, Applicant's representative pointed out that Rozen et al. does not anywhere disclose providing a form to the database and populating that form with the information from that database. The Examiner agreed to review the Rozen et al. reference in light of Applicant's clarifying comments, and to again to consider Applicant's response to the Final Office Action in view of these clarifying comments.

With respect to independent claim 14, this claim was not discussed with the Examiner during the August 19 telephone conversation. However, Applicant's Attorney herein discusses that the Rozen et al. references does not disclose or suggest a contact mechanism by which a requesting entity making a query to the secure requesting system can contact a matching individual only through the system, with no contact information being provided to the requesting entity. In particular, no service is provided by the system of Rozen et al., instead information is simply provided to the requesting entity.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §102

The Final Office Action rejected claims 1-8, 10-19 and 21-23 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Rozen et al. (US 6,073,106). In particular, with respect to independent claims 1 and 16, the Final Office Action asserts that Rozen et al. teaches a secure registry system including:

a database containing selected data on each of a plurality of entities (i.e., categorized personal information stored in a data file), a code (i.e., E-PIN and C-PIN) being stored with at least selected portions of said data for at least selected said entities restricting access to said selected portions to entities defined by each said code (column 4, lines 47-62);

an identity mechanism which permits each entity to securely identify itself to the system (column 4, lines 53-61);

an input mechanism which determines if an identified entity is authorized to enter data into the database, and permits an authorized entity to enter data into the database (column 4, lines 57-67 and column 6, lines 1-11);

an access mechanism which permits access requests to be made to said database (column 7, lines 15-20), each such request including an indication of data requested and at least one of a coded indication of the entity requesting the access and the status of such entity (column 7, lines 20-37); and

an entitlement mechanism, including at least in part said identity mechanism, which determines from at least one of provided coded indication of entity and coded indication of entity status whether the entity is entitled to access the requested data, the mechanism granting access to the requested data if the entity is entitled and denying access if the entity is not entitled (column 4, lines 47-65 and column 7, lines 15-37).

Rozen et al. discloses a method of managing a participant's personal information and of controlling, through a service provider, access to such personal information by a requestor. The method comprises the steps of: prompting the participant to provide an identifier and a password to identify the participant and to provide access by the participant; prompting the participant to identify a first category and a second category of personal information, prompting the participant to provide personal information in each of the categories and to provide a first personal identification number (PIN-1) for the first category of information and a second personal identification number (PIN-2) for the second category of personal information; and prompting the participant to provide an instruction to disclose or to not disclose the personal information in the first category of information in the event that the requestor of the information is one of a defined group, but is unable to provide the participant's first personal identification number (PIN-1). The method also comprises storing the identifier of the participant, the password of the participant and the personal information of the participant in the first and second categories in a

data file, as well as storing the first personal identification number (PIN-1) and instruction whether to disclose or to not disclose the data in the first category of personal information, as well as storing the second personal identification number (PIN-2) in the data file in association with the second category of information. The method also enables alteration of any of the personal information in the data file by the participant upon presentation of the identifier and the password.

The method also enables disclosing of the participant's personal information in the first category on presentation by a requestor of the identifier, the participant and the first personal identification number (PIN-1), as well as disclosing the personal information of the participant in the second category of the data file upon presentation of the identifier of the participant and the second personal identification number (PIN-2) by the requestor. The method also enables disclosing of the personal information in the first personal category, for the data files where the participant has provided an instruction to disclose the information in the first personal category in the event the requestor is unable to provide the first personal identification number (PIN-1), should the service provider determine that the requestor is in one of a defined group of requestors. In particular, referring to Fig. 1D, the method provides access to the participant's emergency category information under certain circumstances. In particular the method queries the requestor whether this is an emergency situation. If the response is no, the above-described methodology can be used. However, if the response is yes, the method prompts the requestor for the participant's identifier and the participant's emergency PIN number (E-PIN). If this information is provided by the requestor, the method enables the requestor to select the mode of transmission for the information in the first personal category, such as by fax or by e-mail. However, if the requestor does not have the participant's emergency PIN in response to the prompt, the method connects the requestor to an operator or customer service representative. The customer service representative solicits the patient's name, date of birth and social security number from the requestor, along with the requestor's name, emergency medical facility and its fax and telephone numbers. The customer service representative then attempts to verify the emergency facility through accessible listings and other records concerning such facilities, to determine if it is a valid facility. If the customer service representative determines that there is a participant in the database corresponding to the patient's information provided by the requestor and if the customer service representative determines that the participant has provided an

769216.1

instruction to disclose such emergency information, and if the customer service representative verifies that the emergency facility is a valid emergency facility, the customer service representative enters an authorization number into the system, as well as the fax number or e-mail address provided by the requestor, whereupon the methodology enables transmission by fax or e-mail of the emergency information.

However, Rozen et al. does not teach, disclose or suggest an access mechanism which, for each access request to the database, includes "at least one of a coded indication of the entity requesting the access and a coded indication of the status of such entity," and does not teach, disclose or suggest an entitlement mechanism, which in response to such access request, "determines from at least one of [the] provided coded indication of entity and coded indication of entity status" whether the entity is entitled to access the requested data, as is claimed in independent claim 1. As discussed above, Rozen et al. merely discloses that the requestor identify the participant by the participant's identifier. There is no identifier of the requestor and there is no coding of the identifier of the requestor. In contrast, Rozen et al. also enables the requestor to either provide an indication that this is an emergency situation and well as the participant's emergency PIN, or to discuss over the telephone with an emergency service provider the information of the participant and to orally provide the pertinent information of the emergency facility requestor and, if the participant has enabled access to such information in an emergency and the operator can validate the requestor through public information, for the information to be communicated to the requestor. However, again, there is no coding of the status of the requestor requesting the information. Accordingly, independent claim 1 is not anticipated by Rozen et al. and patentably distinguishes over Rozen et al. and withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

With respect to independent claim 16, independent claim 16 recites a method for providing a secure registry system including the acts of permitting access requests to the database, wherein each such access request includes "at least one of a coded indication of the entity requesting the access and the status of such entity," and the act of determining whether the entity is entitled to access the requested data, "from at least one of the provided coded indication of entity and coded indication of entity status." Accordingly, independent claim 16 is not anticipated by and patentably distinguishes over Rozen et al. for at least the same reasons as

discussed above with respect to independent claim 1. Therefore, withdrawal of this rejection with respect to claim 16 is also respectfully requested.

With respect to dependent claims 2 and 17, 3 and 18, 4 and 19, and 5-8, each of these dependent claims depend from one of independent claims 1 and 16 and accordingly patentably distinguishes over Rozen et al. for at least the same reasons as independent claims 1 and 16. Accordingly, withdrawal of this rejection with respect to these dependent claims is respectfully requested.

In addition, with respect to claims 3 and 18, the Office Action asserts Rozen et al. teaches wherein each entity has a code regimen by which it can be identified by said identity mechanism and a distress code regimen which the entity may employ when making at least one of entries and changes in the database to indicate that such is being done over duress, and a protection mechanism operative in response to receipt of a distress code regimen for initiating appropriate action for the protection of the entity (column 7, lines 17-37).

However, contrary to the assertions of the Office Action, Rozen et al. does not disclose that each entity (or participant) has a distress code regimen which the entity may employ when making at least one of entries and changes in the database to indicate that such entries and changes are being done under duress, and does not teach, disclose or suggest a protection mechanism operative in response to receipt of such distress code regimen for initiating appropriate action, as is claimed in claims 3 and 18. Rozen et al. simply is silent as to any type of distress or duress situation. Accordingly, dependent claims 3 and 18 patentably distinguish over Rozen et al. for at least this additional reason.

In addition, with respect to dependent claims 4 and 19, the Office Action asserts that Rozen et al. teaches the system, wherein said entitlement mechanism releases selected portions of data for entities to at least selected classes of data requesters based only on the coded status of such entity (column 7, lines 48-53).

As has been discussed above, Rozen et al. does not teach, disclose or suggest that the requestor of the data can be identified by any coded status of such entity. Accordingly, dependent claims 4 and 19 patentably distinguish over Rozen et al. for this additional reason, and withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

In addition, with respect to dependent claim 5, the Office Action asserts Rozen et al. teaches the system, wherein at least selected data requesting entities have a mechanism included

in their processors which automatically adds their status code to each data request sent by the entity to the system (column 7, lines 48-53).

As has been discussed above, Rozen et al. does not teach, disclose or suggest that the requesting entity can in any way identify itself with a status code or a coded indication of the entity. In addition, Rozen et al. does teach, disclose or suggest that the requesting entity includes a mechanism in a processor for automatically adding the status code to such a data request. It is clear no such status code will be automatically generated since no such status code exists. Accordingly, dependent claim 5 also patentably distinguishes over Rozen et al. for at least this additional reason and withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

With respect to dependent claim 7, the Office Action asserts that Rozen et al. teaches the system, wherein said coded indication and coded status for an entity are selectively merged into a single coded input to the system for an access requesting entity, the system including a mechanism for determining the coded status and coded indication from the single coded input (column 7, lines 4-14).

However, as has been discussed above, Rozen et al. does not teach, disclose or suggest a coded indication of the requesting entity or a coded status of the requesting entity, and therefore does not teach, disclose or suggest that the coded indication and the coded status are selectively merged into a single coded input into the system for an access request by the requesting entity, and therefore also does not disclose a mechanism for determining the coded status and coded indication from the single coded input, as is claimed in dependent claim 7. Accordingly, dependent claim 7 patentably distinguishes over Rosen et al. for at least this additional reason and withdrawal of this rejection with respect to dependent claim 7 is respectfully requested.

With respect to dependent claim 8, the Office Action asserts that Rozen et al. teaches the system, wherein an entity requesting data has a mechanism included in their processor which automatically includes with at least selected data requests a coded status indication and a form into which requested information is to be provided (column 7, lines 20-33, column 9, lines 47-64); and wherein said entitlement mechanism provides information from the database to which the entity is entitled in the form provided by the entity (column 7, lines 47-53 and column 9, lines 55-64).

However, as has been discussed above, Rozen et al. does not teach, disclose or suggest that the requesting entity has a processor which automatically includes a coded status indication

of the requesting entity. In addition, Rozen et al. does not teach, disclose or suggest that the requesting entity has a processor which also includes a form into which the information is to be provided. Rozen et al. is completely silent as to whether the requesting party can have a particular form, such as a health form, that lists certain information to be provided, and that the methodology of Rozen et al. can gather the information that is solicited by the form. Accordingly, dependent claim 8 patentably distinguishes over Rozen et al. for at least this additional reason, and withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

With respect to independent claims 10 and 21, the Final Office Action asserts Rozen et al. teaches a secure registry system for entities, each of which is identified by a multi-character public code, the system including:

a database from which the public code for each entity may be obtained (column 4, lines 47-62); and

a processor at a provider of services for entities (i.e., a service provider's server, see column 5, lines 32-41), said processor including a mechanism for mapping each received public code to data required by the provider in order to provide the services (column 7, lines 4-17), receiving the public code for an entity on whose behalf services are to be provided, and using the corresponding mapped data to perform the services (column 4, lines 47-65 and column 7, lines 15-37).

Independent claim 10 recites, *inter alia*, a secure registry system that comprises a database from which a public code for each entity using the secure registry system may be obtained, and a processor at a provider of services that includes a mechanism for mapping the received public code to data required by the provider of services, and using the mapped data to perform the services.

In contrast, Rozen et al. does not teach, disclose or suggest a database from which a provider of services can obtain a public code of an entity seeking such services. In contrast, Rozen et al. merely teaches that a requesting party provide the ID (social security number) of the entity that is seeking information. In other words, Rozen et al. discloses that the requesting party knows the identification number of the party for which it seeks information. Rozen et al. makes no provision for the code not being known by the requesting party, other than the emergency exception discussed herein.

769216.1

In addition, Rozen et al. does not teach, disclose or suggest a processor at a provider of services that includes a mechanism for mapping the received public code from such database to data required by the provider of services in order to provide such services, and using such mapped data to perform the services. In contrast, as has been discussed above, Rozen et al. discloses that in response to a requesting party providing an identification number for a participant (e.g. Social Security Number), and a PIN for the participant, through an interface, such as the telephone touch dial, the remote system discloses personal information, such as health-related information, about the participant to the health service provider. However, such identification information is not information that is determined from a public code in a database by a processor at the service provider, and such health related information need not be information required by the provider in order to provide the services by the service providers. In contrast, such information is typically sensitive information, for example, such as a participant's mental health history, drug or alcohol rehabilitation treatments, psychiatric medications, treating practitioner, contagious diseases, sexually-transmitted diseases, maternal and/or gynecological history, previous surgical procedures, emergency contact person, primary insurance, physician, allergies, current medications, immunizations, illnesses, hospitalizations, surgeries and medical implants. Much of this information is not information that is needed to or required to provide a service by the service provider.

With respect to independent claim 21, independent claim 21 recites a database from which the public code for each entity may be obtained, and a processor receiving the public code and mapping the public code into data required by the provider of services in order to provide the services. Accordingly, independent claim 21 patentably distinguishes over Rozen et al. for at least the same reasons as discussed above with respect to independent claim 10, and withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

With respect to dependent claims 11 and 22 and 12 and 23, which depend from independent claims 10 and 21, respectively, each of these claims patentably distinguishes over Rozen et al. for at least the same reasons as the independent claims 10 and 21, and therefore withdrawal of this rejection with respect to these claims is respectfully requested.

In addition, with respect to dependent claims 11 and 22, the Office Action asserts that Rozen et al. teaches the system wherein said provider provides delivery services, the mapped data being an address to which item are to be delivered for the entity, the provider receiving an

769216.1

item to be delivered and a public code for the recipient, and using the public code to obtain the appropriate address for delivery of the item (column 7, lines 65-67 and column 8, lines 1-12).

However, Rozen et al. is completely silent to the service provider being anything other than health-related services and certainly does not teach, disclose or suggest that the service provider provides delivery services, and that the mapped data provided by the system can be a private address of an item to be delivered to a recipient, or that the public code obtained from the database is used to obtain the address. In particular, Applicant discloses and claims a particular embodiment of the invention, wherein an entity can confidentially provide address information in the secure registry system, which can be accessed by a service provider that accesses the entity's public code from a public database, and the service provider can use the public code to map such data into the address of the entity for delivering an item to such address. For example, the address can be any of a physical mailing address, an e-mail address, and the like. Rozen et al. does not teach, disclose or suggest any such thing. Accordingly, dependent claims 11 and 22 patentably distinguish over Rozen et al., and withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

In addition, with respect to dependent claims 12 and 23, the Office Action asserts that Rozen et al. teaches the system wherein said provider provides telephone service, the mapped data being a current telephone number for the entity, the provider receiving the public code and connecting the party providing the public code to the current telephone number of the entity (column 9, lines 47-64).

However, as has been discussed above with respect to dependent claims 11 and 22, dependent claims 12 and 23 recite an embodiment of Applicant's invention, wherein an entity can provide in a secure registry system a telephone number to be kept private and which is not publicly available, and a service provider can obtain from a public database the public code for such entity, and use the public code to obtain the telephone number of the entity. In addition, dependent claims 12 and 23 also recite that the service provider connects the party providing the public code to the entity using the telephone number. Again, Rozen et al. is completely silent as to any such embodiment and certainly doesn't disclose using the telephone number to connect the requesting party to the participant, and therefore dependent claims 12 and 23 patentably distinguish over Rozen et al. and withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

In addition, Applicant has previously added dependent claims 24-25, which depend from independent claims 10 and 21 respectively. Claims 24-25 recite that the data provided, by the system and method of this claimed embodiment, to the service provider to perform a service is provided so that the service provider can perform the service and without actually disclosing the data to the service provider. For example, the telephone number or the address of the entity for whom the data is requested is not disclosed to the service provider. In contrast, the service provider is simply allowed to connect to the telephone number, or the package to be delivered or e-mail to be sent can be printed with a barcode or can be used to deliver the package or e-mail, without the actual address being provided to the service provider. Rozen et al. is completely silent as to any holding in confidence the information by the requesting entity for a participant in the system of Rozen et al., and still providing the service. Accordingly, claims 24-25 also patentably distinguish over Rozen et al.

With respect to independent claim 13, the Final Office Action asserts Rozen et al. teaches a secure registry system including:

A database containing selected data on each of a plurality of entities (column 4, lines 47-62);

A mechanism by which an organization desiring access to data in said database may gain such access (column 7, lines 15-20), each said organization having a processor (i.e., requesters computer, see column 5, lines 32-41) which generates data requests, each such data request including a form in which such data is to be provided (i.e., a form in which data is provided includes screen viewing, e-mail and fax) (column 7, lines 20-33, column 9, lines 47-64); and

A response mechanism which collects data required by said form for a given request, formats the collected data in said form, and sends the formatted data to the organization generating the request (column 7, lines 47-53 and column 9, lines 55-64).

In contrast to the assertions of the Office Action, as has been discussed above with respect to dependent claim 8, Rozen et al. does not teach, disclose or suggest a mechanism by which an organization desiring access to data in the database of the secure registry system comprises a processor which generates data requests, including a form in which such data is to be provided, and a response mechanism which, in response to such form, formats the collected data in that form and sends the formatted data in that form. The Office Action asserts that the fact that Rozen et al. discloses that the data can be provided in either e-mail or fax format is

providing a data in a form as claimed by Applicant. However, Applicant has disclosed and recited that the form is, for example, a particular form which solicits particular data, such as a tax form, or a job application form, and the like. Applicant has also disclosed and claimed in other claims, that the data can be provided in various formats. Accordingly, Applicant distinguishes between forms and formats, but the Office Action attempts to use the same disclosure and rationale to reject both claims. This rejection is clearly improper. Accordingly, independent claim 13 is not anticipated by Rozen et al. and withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

With respect to independent claim 14, the Final Office Action asserts that Rozen et al. teaches a secure registry system including:

a database containing biographical data (i.e., personal information) on a plurality of individuals (column 4, lines 47-62);

a query mechanism by which an entity trying to find an individual can input to the system a query containing selected biographical data on the individual (column 7, lines 47-53 and column 7, lines 17-23);

a response mechanism (i.e., screen viewing, fax or e-mail) operative in response to a query for providing to the entity selected information on individuals in the system matching the query biological information (column 7, lines 47-53, and column 7, lines 17-33); and

a contact mechanism by which the entity making the query can contact a matching individual only through the system, no contact information being provided to the entity (i.e., the entity making the query gains access to biographical data of the entity, through the system) (column 7, lines 47-53, and column 7, lines 17-33).

However, as has been discussed above, for example, with respect to dependent claims 12 and 23, Rozen et al. does not teach, disclose or suggest a contact mechanism by which an entity making a query to the secure registry system "can contact a matching individual only through the system, no contact information being provided to the entity." In particular, as has been discussed above with respect to independent claims 12 and 23 and new dependent claims 24-25, Rozen et al. is silent with respect to providing the service through the system of Rozen et al. and is also silent as to not disclosing the information to the requesting entity, but still providing the service through the system of Rozen et al. Accordingly, independent claim 14 patentably distinguishes over Rozen et al. and withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

With respect to independent claim 15, the Final Office Action asserts Rozen et al. teaches a storage media containing machine readable code which facilitates communication between a remote machine running the code and a secure registry system of a type (i.e., communication between a requesting computer and a service provider's server via a web site, see column 5, lines 31-47) having a database containing selected data on each of a plurality of entities and restricted access to at least portions of such data (column 4, lines 47-62), the code causing access requests from the machine to the system to each automatically include at least a status code for the machine (column 7, lines 47-53 and column 7, lines 17-23) and a format in which data requested is to be presented for response (i.e., a form in which data is provided includes screen viewing, e-mail and fax) (column 7, lines 20-33, column 9, lines 47-64), the system recognizing the status code to control access to data in the database and using the format to select the data to be accessed and to control the format in which accessed data is returned to the machine (column 7, lines 47-53, and column 7, lines 17-33).

Independent claim 15 patentably distinguishes over the Rozen, et al. reference for the same reasons as discussed above with respect to independent claim 13. In particular, Rozen, et al. does not teach, disclose or suggest machine readable code which facilitates communication between a remote machine and a secure registry system, which is "configured to use the form in which the data is requested to select the data to be accessed, and to control the format in which the accessed data is to be provided to a remote machine." As has been discussed above with respect to independent claim 13, Rozen, et al. is completely silent as to accessing data based upon a form to be completed. Accordingly, independent claim 15 is not anticipated by Rozen, et al. and withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §103

The Final Office Action rejected claims 9 and 20 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Rozen (US 6,073,106). In particular, the Office Action asserts: Rozen et al. teaches a secure registry system as applied to claims 1 and 16 above. Furthermore, Rozen et al. teaches a database containing selected data on each of a plurality of entities (i.e., categorized personal information stored in a data file), a code (i.e., E-PIN and C-PIN) being stored with at least selected portions of said data for at least selected said entities restricting access to said selected portions to entities defined by each said code (column 4, lines 47-62); and an

entitlement mechanism, including at least in part said identity mechanism, which determines from at least one of provided coded indication of entity and coded indication of entity status whether the entity is entitled to access the requested data, the mechanism granting access to the requested data if the entity is entitled and denying access if the entity is not entitled (column 4, lines 47-65 and column 7, lines 15-37). Further, Rozen et al. suggests storing personal information in additional storage such as smart cards (column 2, lines 39-67, column 4, lines 1-5). However, Rozen et al. fails to explicitly teach storing data in additional database outside the system. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made incorporate a method of storing relevant data in additional database outside the system in Rozen et al. It would have been obvious because Rozen et al. suggests storing personal information in additional storage such as smart cards (column 2, lines 39-67, column 4, lines 1-5). Based on this suggestion it would have been obvious to store relevant data in additional database outside the system in order to store personal information in multiple location.

Although Applicants do not agree with the assertions of the Final Office Action and do not accede to the asserted modification of Rozen et al., dependent claims 9 and 20 depend from independent claims 1 and 16, respectively, and therefore patentably distinguish over Rozen et al. for at least the same reasons discussed herein with respect to independent claims 1 and 16. Accordingly, withdrawal of this rejection with respect to these dependent claims is respectfully requested.

The Final Office Action also rejected claims 24-43 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Rozen (US 6,073,106) in view of Bernstein (US 5,915,023). The Applicant does not address the merits of each of the dependent claims 24-43 in view of this asserted combination of references, but reserves the right to do so. However, in view Applicant's position that each of the independent claims patently distinguishes over the Rozen et al. reference, and in view of that the newly recited Bernstein et al. does not cure the infirmities of the Rozen et al. reference as to the independent claims, the asserted combination of references does not anticipate or render obvious the independent claims. Therefore the asserted combination cannot anticipate or render obvious any of the independent claims 24-43.

Accordingly, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.